

AUG 15 2011

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JOSE RAMON ROMERO GOMEZ,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
---

No. 05-75302

Agency No. A095-450-457

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted August 11, 2011\*\*

Before: THOMAS, SILVERMAN, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Jose Ramon Romero Gomez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his application for cancellation of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

evidence findings of fact and review de novo questions of law. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's finding that Romero Gomez was statutorily barred from establishing good moral character, and therefore ineligible for cancellation of removal, based on his testimony that he helped his wife illegally cross the border into the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1101(f)(3), 1229b(b)(1)(B); *Sanchez v. Holder*, 560 F.3d 1028, 1034 n.1 (9th Cir. 2009) (en banc).

Romero Gomez's contention that his admission of alien smuggling could not be used against him because he had not been advised of the elements of alien smuggling lacks merit. *See Sanchez*, 560 F.3d at 1034 n.1.

Contrary to Romero Gomez's contention, the IJ's decision was sufficiently detailed and reasoned to facilitate our review on appeal. *Cf. Movsisian v. Ashcroft*, 395 F.3d 1095, 1098 (9th Cir. 2005) (BIA abused its discretion where it failed to provide provide specific and cogent reasons for its decision).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**